



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE TRIALS OF NEUTRALITY

SIR,—About the time of the appearance of the December number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW there was published in the *Minneapolis Journal* an open letter signed by Mr. James A. Peterson, a one-time member of Congress from this State, and a very eminent lawyer, on the subject of "Germany and the Neutrality of Belgium," in which he reached a conclusion diametrically opposite to that arrived at by Professor A. G. De Lapradelle in his article in the December NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW entitled "The Neutrality of Belgium."

I was very much interested in the views of these gentlemen, particularly in what they set forth as being the facts in the case—they being so different. And the result was that I got into correspondence with Mr. Peterson, and tried to "get a rise" out of Professor De Lapradelle. Mr. Peterson has inferred from the fact that I called his attention to the different conclusion reached by Professor De Lapradelle from that reached by himself, that I must have pro-Ally sympathies or prejudices; whereas my only desire was to discover, if possible, what the truth is among the divergent opinions of the parties. Among other things that Mr. Peterson says about the De Lapradelle article is this:

"This article forms part of a series of articles published by the English government in the American press to justify it in declaring war on Germany. The article is merely a 'brief' on his side of the question, and I am greatly surprised that a magazine like THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW should publish it without so stating. After a most careful study of this article I assert that it is unreliable as to statement of facts and that the logic employed by the author is in many cases, nothing less than absurd—in short, it is so full of holes, both as to facts and argument, that it would have no standing in any court that might have the matter up for adjudication. Now, so far as Professor De Lapradelle's reputation as a high authority on international law is concerned, I do not believe it is of the character you have been led to believe. I have been asked by several people to write an article in answer to Professor De Lapradelle's brief in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, but I am convinced there would be no use in doing so, for the reason that THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW would refuse to publish it or any article, no matter how excellent, unless it was pro-English."

In view of what Mr. Peterson says in regard to the position of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, which, as I believe, is wholly incorrect, I would like very much to hear from you as to the real position of THE REVIEW in matters connected with the present Great War.

F. L. MOFFETT.

MINNEAPOLIS.

THE REVIEW stands with the President, who, in a most trying and perplexing position, has made no mistake that we can perceive. Incidentally, Dr. Dernburg and Ambassador Dumba, whose articles appeared in the December and September numbers, respectively, of THE REVIEW, will be surprised to learn from the eminent Mr. Peterson that they are "pro-English."—EDITOR.

SIR,—Certainly we cannot do without THE REVIEW. It is the friend of years, and my Christmas to many—but am sending in only two names this year. It has grown a little too English to be neutral, and we are wondering after

Germany's sacrifice what? Will it be America if she does not bow to the Allies? Are we afraid to be just? But we cannot do without Colonel Harvey—the editor of the century.

MRS. K. B. HOSLER.

HALLSVILLE, OHIO.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S OPINION

SIR,—As a Britisher who tries to think universally I wish to thank you for the part you have so ably played in the cause of peace, and I earnestly hope your efforts may make the governments of the world get some understanding of the absolute futility of endeavoring to encompass their aims by war.

Britain learned many decades ago (aided by a very forcible lesson from America) that nationalities and peoples cannot be ruled by force or one nation assimilate another nation.

America's greatness has not been achieved by armaments, and is a complete answer to the slavery that would be engendered if German (or I should say Prussian) military conceptions prevailed.

America can do more than any other power to-day in forwarding God's rule of Right, and if she will only openly pronounce her protest against the violation of the fundamental principles underlying her greatness, she will be rendering a service to mankind that is well-nigh incalculable.

Is Prussia to be allowed to set back the sands of time by two hundred years?

Again thanking you,
BRISTOL, ENGLAND.

G. H. FARMER.

REWARD FOR OUR COLONEL

SIR,—I address you in the interest of justice toward Theodore Roosevelt, by Bryan, Wilson, and the Democratic party. I earnestly suggest that the twenty-five millions that has been proposed by them to be given outright to Colombia shall instead be kept, and a bond issue of the same amount be made with interest at three per cent. per annum, and the same be voted by the Democratic Congress to be paid to Theodore Roosevelt and his heirs for ever. While this would produce an income of ten times the President's salary, it has been well worth it to them in his securing to them the government of the country and its offices. And the proofs again of this great service by him in the recent election are clear—in that if the remaining one-fourth of *his* party had voted with the Republicans at this last election, the Republicans would have safely won control of both Senate and House; but his continued efforts prevented them from doing so, therefore I think this act of simple justice should be done him.

FRANK C. BOISE.

DENVER, COLO.